arXiv:1407.1934v3 [math.DG] 8 Apr 2015

Monopole type equations on compact symplectic 6-manifolds

Yuuji Tanaka

Abstract

In this article, we consider a gauge-theoretic equation on compact symplectic 6-manifolds, which forms an elliptic system after gauge fixing. This can be thought of as a higher-dimensional analogue of the Seiberg–Witten equation. By using the virtual neighbourhood method by Ruan [R], we define an integer-valued invariant, a 6-dimensional Seiberg–Witten invariant, from the moduli space of solutions to the equations, assuming that the moduli space is compact; and it has no reducible solutions. We prove that the moduli spaces are compact if the underlying manifold is a compact Kähler threefold. We then compute the integers in some cases.

1 Introduction

Let X be a compact symplectic 6-manifold with symplectic form ω. We take an almost complex structure J compatible with the symplectic form ω. We fix a $Spin^c$-structure c on X. We denote the characteristic line bundle for c by ξ. Then there exists a line bundle L such that $\xi = L^2 \otimes K_X^{-1}$, where K_X^{-1} is the anti-canonical bundle of X. Let A' be a connection on $\xi = L^2 \otimes K_X^{-1}$. We write $A' = A_c + 2A$, where A_c is the canonical connection on K_X^{-1}, which is fixed, and A is a connection of a line bundle L. We then consider the following equations on compact symplectic 6-manifolds (see Section 2 for more detail), seeking for a connection A of L, $u \in \Omega^{0,3}(X)$, $\alpha \in C^\infty(L)$ and $\beta \in \Omega^{0,2}(L)$.

$$\bar{\partial}_A \alpha + \bar{\partial}_A^* \beta = 0, \quad \bar{\partial}_A \beta = -\frac{1}{2}\alpha u,$$
$$F_{A'}^{0,2} + \bar{\partial}^* u = \frac{1}{4}\bar{\alpha}\beta, \quad \Lambda F_{A'}^{1,1} = -\frac{i}{8}\left(|u|^2 + |\beta|^2 - |\alpha|^2\right).$$

where $\Lambda = (\omega\wedge)^*$.

Remark 1.1. Richard P. W. Thomas once considered similar equations in [Th]. Our equations partially emerged out of discussion with Dominic Joyce around the end of 2010 together with the computation in the proof of Proposition 4.1.

These equations from an elliptic system with gauge fixing condition. We expect they enjoy nice properties similar to the original Seiberg–Witten equations such as the compactness of the moduli space.

In this article, we prove that the moduli spaces are compact if the underlying manifold is a compact Kähler threefold. Hence, in this case, one can define an integer $n_X(c)$ for a $Spin^c$-structure c, a 6-dimensional Seiberg–Witten invariant, by using Ruan's virtual neighbourhood method [R], if there are no reducible solutions. We compute the numbers in some cases as follows. These are analogues of those for the Seiberg–Witten invariants in 4 dimensions. Firstly, we have the following.

Theorem 1.2 (Corollary 4.15)**.** *Let X be a compact Kähler threefold with $K_X < 0$, and let c be a $Spin^c$-structure on X with $\deg \xi < 0$, where ξ is the characteristic line bundle of the $Spin^c$-structure. Then $n_X(c) = 0$.*

For the case where $K_X > 0$, we get the following.

Theorem 1.3 (Theorem 4.16)**.** *Let X be a compact Kähler threefold with $K_X > 0$. Let s_c be the $Spin^c$-structure coming from the complex structure. We also assume that $c_2(X) = 0$. Then $n_X(s_c) = 1$.*

The organisation of this article is as follows. In Section 2, we briefly describe $Spin^c$-structures and the Dirac operators on compact symplectic manifolds, and recall the Seiberg–Witten equation on compact symplectic 4-manifolds. Then we introduce our equation in six dimensions and describe its linearisation. In Section 3, we introduce an integer-valued invariant, which can be thought of as a 6-dimensional Seiberg–Witten invariant, from the moduli space of solutions to the equation by using Ruan's virtual neighbourhood method. We then consider the Kähler case in Section 4. We see that the equations reduce to the vortex type equations in this case. We then describe the moduli space for the negative degree case. We also prove that the moduli spaces are compact when the underlying manifold is a compact Kähler threefold, and compute the integers in some cases.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Dominic Joyce for enlightening discussion on the subject around the end of 2010, and for useful comments and helpful suggestions on the manuscripts. I am grateful to Mikio

Furuta for helpful discussion and valuable comments. I would like to thank a referee for useful comments and for pointing out a gap in the earlier version of the manuscript. I am grateful to Oscar García-Prada for sending me some useful references. I would also like to thank Hiroshi Iritani and Thomas Walpuski for useful comments.

2 Monopole type invariants for compact symplectic 6-manifolds

2.1 Spin^c-structure and the Dirac operator on compact symplectic manifolds

A general reference for $Spin^c$-structures and its Dirac operator is Lawson–Michelsohn [LM].

Spin^c-structure on compact symplectic manifolds. Let X be a compact symplectic manifold with symplectic form ω. We fix an almost complex structure J compatible with ω. Any almost complex manifold has the canonical $Spin^c$ structure associated with the almost complex structure, whose spinor bundle is given by $\oplus_i \Omega^{0,i}(X)$. The characteristic line bundle is given by K_X^{-1}. If S is a spinor bundle on X, then we can write

$$S = \oplus_i \Omega^{0,i}(X) \otimes L,\ S^+ = \oplus \Omega^{0,even}(X) \otimes L,\ S^- = \oplus \Omega^{0,odd}(X) \otimes L,$$

where L is some line bundle on X. In particular, if underlying manifolds are symplectic 6-manifolds, we have $S^+ = L \oplus (L \otimes \Omega^{0,2}(X))$.

The Dirac operator on symplectic manifolds. The Dirac operator $D_{A'}$ associated to a connection A' on the characteristic line bundle ξ is given by the following composition.

$$\Gamma(S) \xrightarrow{\nabla_{A'}} \Gamma(T^*X \otimes S) \xrightarrow{metric} \Gamma(TX \otimes S) \xrightarrow{\rho} \Gamma(S),$$

where ρ is the Clifford multiplication. In almost complex case, it is written as $D_{A'} = \sqrt{2}(\bar{\partial}_A + \bar{\partial}_A^*)$, where A is a connection on L.

2.2 The Seiberg–Witten equations on symplectic 4-manifolds

We recall the Seiberg–Witten equations in the original form first, which was introduced by Witten [W] (see also [M]). Let M be a compact, oriented,

smooth 4-manifold. We fix a Riemannian metric and a $Spin^c$ structure on M. We denote by S^+ the half spinor bundle over M associated to the $Spin^c$-structure, and by ξ the characteristic line bundle of the $Spin^c$-structure.

The Seiberg–Witten equations on M are equations seeking for a connection A' of ξ and a section of S^+ satisfying the following.

$$D_{A'}\psi = 0, \quad F^+_{A'} = \frac{1}{4}\tau(\psi \otimes \psi^*),$$

where $D_{A'}$ is the Dirac operator associated to the connection A', $F^+_{A'}$ is the self-dual part of the curvature $F_{A'}$ of the connection A', τ is a map $\tau : \mathrm{End}\,(S^+) \to \Lambda^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}$ defined by the Clifford multiplication on S^+.

We next consider these equations on a compact symplectic 4-manifold with symplectic structure ω (see [Ta1], [Ta2], also [BG], [G2], [HT] and [Ko]). We fix an almost complex structure compatible with ω. Then we have the following decomposition of the self-dual part of the curvature. $F^+_{A'} = F^{2,0}_{A'} + F^0_{A'} + F^{0,2}_{A'}$, where $F^0_{A'}$ is the ω-component of the curvature $F_{A'}$. In addition, we can consider the canonical $Spin^c$ structure whose characteristic line bundle is $K_M^{-1} = \Lambda^{0,3}(T^*M \otimes \mathbb{C})$. Using this canonical $Spin^c$ structure, we can write the half-spinor bundle S^+ for any $Spin^c$ structure as $S^+ = L \oplus (L \otimes K_M^{-1})$, where L is some complex line bundle on M. We also have the canonical $Spin^c$ connection A_c on K_M^{-1}, and each connection A' of the characteristic line bundle is written by $A' = A_c + 2A$, where A is a connection of L. We write a spinor as $\psi = \varphi_0 u_0 + \varphi_2$, where u_0 is a section which satisfies $D_{A_c} u_0 = 0$, and $\varphi_0 \in \Gamma(L)$, $\varphi_2 \in \Gamma(L \otimes K^{-1})$. Then the Seiberg–Witten equations becomes as follows.

$$\bar\partial_A \varphi_0 + \bar\partial_A^* \varphi_2 = 0,$$
$$F^{0,2}_{A'} = \frac{\bar\varphi_0 \varphi_2}{2}, \quad \Lambda F^{1,1}_{A'} = -\frac{i}{4}(|\varphi_2|^2 - |\varphi_0|^2),$$

where $\Lambda := (\wedge\omega)^*$.

2.3 Equations in six dimensions

Let X be a compact symplectic 6-manifold with symplectic form ω. We fix an almost complex structure J compatible with ω. We take a $Spin^c$-structure s on X, and denote by ξ the associated complex line bundle over X.

There is a $Spin^c$-structure canonically determined by J, which we denote by s_c. The corresponding line bundle for s_c is given by the anti-canonical bundle K_X^{-1}. For a $Spin^c$-structure s, there is a complex line bundle L, and

the corresponding line bundle for s, which we denote by ξ, can be written as $\xi = K_X^{-1} \otimes L^2$, and a connection A' of ξ can be written as $A' = A_c + 2A$, where A_c is a connection of K_X^{-1} and A is a connection of L.

We consider the following equations for $(A, u, (\alpha, \beta))$, where A is a connection of L, $u \in \Omega^{0,3}(X)$, $\alpha \in \Omega^0(X, L)$ and $\beta \in \Omega^{0,2}(X, L)$.

$$\bar{\partial}_A \alpha + \bar{\partial}_A^* \beta = 0, \quad \bar{\partial}_A \beta = -\frac{1}{2}\alpha u, \tag{2.1}$$

$$F_{A'}^{0,2} + \bar{\partial}^* u = \frac{1}{4}\bar{\alpha}\beta, \quad \Lambda F_{A'}^{1,1} = -\frac{i}{8}\left(|u|^2 + |\beta|^2 - |\alpha|^2\right). \tag{2.2}$$

We call $\mathcal{G} := \Gamma(X, U(1))$ a gauge group. This is a set of all smooth $U(1)$-valued functions. This group acts on solutions to (2.1) and (2.2) by

$$A' \mapsto A' - \sigma^{-1} dg, \quad u \mapsto u, \quad \alpha \mapsto g\alpha, \quad \beta \mapsto g\beta,$$

where $g \in \mathcal{G}$. The equations (2.1) and (2.2) are equivariant under this action, namely, if $(A', u, (\alpha, \beta))$ is a solution to the equations (2.1) and (2.2), then so is $g(A', u, (\alpha, \beta))$ for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$. We say two solutions $(A_1', u_1, (\alpha_1, \beta_1))$, $(A_2', u_2, (\alpha_2, \beta_2))$ are *gauge equivalent* if there exists a gauge transformation $g \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $(A_1', u_1, (\alpha_1, \beta_1)) = g(A_2', u_2, (\alpha_2, \beta_2))$.

As in the Seiberg–Witten case, the stabilizer in $\mathcal{G}$ of $(A, u, (\alpha, \beta)) \in \mathcal{C}$ is trivial unless $\alpha = \beta = 0$. We then define the following.

Definition 2.1. $(A', u, (\alpha, \beta))$ is said to be *reducible* if $(\alpha, \beta) \equiv 0$. It is called *irreducible* otherwise.

Note that the stabilizer group in the case of reducibles is the group of constant maps from X to S^1, namely, it is S^1.

2.4 Linearisation

The linearisation of the equation (2.2) fits into the following Atiyah–Singer–Hitchin type complex.

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega^0(X, i\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \Omega^1(X, i\mathbb{R}) \oplus \Omega^{0,3}(X) \longrightarrow \Omega^+(X, i\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $\Omega^+(X, i\mathbb{R}) := \Omega^0(X, i\mathbb{R})\omega \oplus \Omega^2(X, i\mathbb{R}) \cap (\Omega^{2,0} \oplus \Omega^{0,2})$. This is an elliptic complex, and the index of this can be computed by the following Dolbeault complex.

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega^{0,0}(X) \longrightarrow \Omega^{0,1}(X) \longrightarrow \Omega^{0,2}(X) \longrightarrow \Omega^{0,3}(X) \longrightarrow 0. \tag{2.3}$$

Here we identified $\Omega^0(X) \oplus \Omega^0\omega$ with $\Omega^{0,0}(X)$ and $\Omega^1(X)$ with $\Omega^{0,1}(X)$.

On the other hand, the linearisation of (2.1) is given by

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega^{0,0}(X,L) \oplus \Omega^{0,2}(X,L) \longrightarrow \Omega^{0,1}(X,L) \oplus \Omega^{0,3}(X,L) \longrightarrow 0. \quad (2.4)$$

Hence we obtain the following.

Proposition 2.2. *The virtual dimension of the moduli space $\mathcal{M}$ is given by*

$$-\frac{1}{12}c_1(X)c_2(X) - \frac{1}{24}c_1(L)\left(2c_1(X)^2 + 2c_2(X) + 6c_1(L)c_1(X) + 4c_1(L)^2\right). \quad (2.5)$$

proof. The virtual dimension is the sum of the indices of (2.3) and (2.4) with the opposite signs. By the index formula, it is

$$-\int_X \mathrm{td}(X) - \int_X \mathrm{ch}(L)\cdot \mathrm{td}(X).$$

Here, $\mathrm{td}(X) = 1 + \frac{1}{2}c_1(X) + \frac{1}{12}\left(c_1(X)^2 + c_2(X)\right) + \frac{1}{24}c_1(X)c_2(X)$, $\mathrm{ch}(L) = 1 + c_1(L) + \frac{1}{2}c_1(L)^2 + \frac{1}{6}c_1(L)^3$. Thus, we get (2.5). □

3 Invariant

Let X be a compact symplectic 6-manifold with symplectic form ω. We take an almost complex structure compatible with ω, and a $Spin^c$-structure c on X with the characteristic line bundle ξ being $K_X^{-1} \otimes L^2$, where L is a line bundle on X.

Moduli space. Fix $p > 6$. Let ℓ be a positive integer. We consider the following Sobolev completion of the configuration space.

$$\mathcal{C}_{L^p_\ell} := \mathcal{A}_{L^p_\ell}(\xi) \times L^p_\ell(\Lambda^{0,3}) \times L^p_\ell((\Lambda^{0,0} \oplus \Lambda^{0,2}) \otimes L),$$

where $\mathcal{A}_{L^p_\ell}(\xi)$ is the space of L^p_ℓ-connections on ξ. We also consider $L^p_{\ell+1}$-completion of the space of gauge group $\mathcal{G} := \mathrm{Map}(X, U(1))$ to get smooth action on the configuration space $\mathcal{C}_{L^p_\ell}$. We then take the quotient

$$\mathcal{M}_{L^p_\ell} := \{(A,u,(\alpha,\beta)) \in \mathcal{C}_{L^p_\ell} \,:\, (A,u,(\alpha,\beta)) \text{ satisfies (2.1) and (2.2)}\}/\mathcal{G}_{L^p_{\ell+1}},$$

and call it the *moduli space* of solutions to the equations (2.1) and (2.2).

We have the following.

Proposition 3.1. *Fix $p > 6$. Let ℓ be either a positive integer or ∞. Let $(A, u, (\alpha, \beta)) \in \mathcal{C}_{L^p_\ell}$ be a solution to the equations* (2.1) *and* (2.2)*. Then there exists a gauge transformation $g \in \mathcal{G}_{L^p_{\ell+1}}$ such that $g(A, u, (\alpha, \beta))$ lies in $L^p_{\ell+1}$.*

proof. This is a consequence of a local slice theorem [U, Th. 1.3] (see also [WK, Th. 8.1]) saying that there exists a smooth connection A_0 and a gauge transformation $g \in \mathcal{G}_{L^p_{\ell+1}}$ such that $d^*_A(g(A) - A_0) = 0$. Then the assertion holds since the equations (2.1) and (2.2) with the above gauge condition from an elliptic system. □

Hence we abbreviate the Sobolev indices on the moduli space hereafter.

Virtual Neighbourhood. We consider the following case.

(A1) The moduli space is compact; and

(A2) there are no reducible solutions.

Assuming the above (A1) and (A2), one can invoke the virtual neighbourhood method by Ruan [R] to define an integer-valued invariant from the moduli space $\mathcal{M}$, since a triple $(\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}, F)$, with $\mathcal{F} := L^p_1(\Lambda^+ \otimes i\mathbb{R}) \times L^p_1((\Lambda^{0,1} \oplus \Lambda^{0,3}) \otimes L)$ and $F : \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{F}$ defined by the equations (2.1) and (2.2), where $\Lambda^+ := \Lambda^0\omega \oplus \left(\Lambda^2 \cap (\Lambda^{2,0} \oplus \Lambda^{0,2})\right)$, forms a *compact-smooth triple* of [R, Def. 2.1].

From a compact-smooth triple, one can construct a *virtual neighbourhood* $(U, \mathbb{R}^k, S)$ of $\mathcal{M}$ with U being a smooth neighbourhood of dimension $-\mathrm{ind}(L) + k$, where L is the linearised operator of the equations (2.1) and (2.2), and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathcal{M} \times \{0\} \subset U \subset \mathcal{B} \times \mathbb{R}^k$, and $S : U \to \mathbb{R}^k$ with $S^{-1}(0) = \mathcal{M}$. Here, the orientation of U is given by orienting the determinant line bundle $\det(L)$ of the linearised operator L from an orientation of $H^0(X, i\mathbb{R}), H^1(X, i\mathbb{R}), H^{0,3}(X)$ and $H^+(X, i\mathbb{R})$. One can then define a *virtual neighbourhood invariant* μ_F in [R] as follows. (i) For $\mathrm{ind}(L) = 0$, μ_F is defined to be the algebraic counting of points in $S^{-1}(y)$ for a regular value y; and (ii) for $-\mathrm{ind}(L) > 0$, μ_F is defined as $\mu_F : H^{-\mathrm{ind}(L)}(\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{Z}) \to \mathbb{Z}$ by $\mu_F(\alpha) := \alpha([S^{-1}(y)])$ for a regular value y, where $\alpha \in H^{-\mathrm{ind}(L)}(\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{Z})$. In [R, Prop. 2.6], Ruan proved that the above μ_F is independent of y and a triple $(U, \mathbb{R}^k, S)$.

Invariant. We denote by $\mathcal{C}^*$ the open subset of $\mathcal{C}$ consisting of irreducible equivalence classes. We consider the subgroup $\mathcal{G}_0$ of $\mathcal{G}$ consisting of all gauge transformations which are trivial on the fibre over a fixed point $x \in X$. This is the kernel of the morphism $\mathcal{G} \to S^1$ defined by evaluating on the fibre over x. We then consider the quotient $\mathcal{B}^0 := \mathcal{C}^*/\mathcal{G}_0$. This is the total space of a principal S^1-bundle, we denote it by ℓ, over $\mathcal{B}^*$. Then we define an integer $n_X(c)$ by (i) μ_F if $\mathrm{ind}(L) = 0$; (ii) $\mu_F(c_1(\ell)^{-\mathrm{ind}(L)/2})$ if $-\mathrm{ind}(L) > 0$; and (iii) 0 if $-\mathrm{ind}(L) < 0$.

Examples are given in the next section.

4 Invariants for compact Kähler threefolds

We describe the equations on compact Kähler threefolds in Section 4.1. In Section 4.2, we describe the moduli spaces for the case $\deg \xi < 0$, where ξ is the characteristic line bundle for a *Spin*^{c}-structure on a compact Kähler threefold. In Section 4.3, we prove that the moduli spaces are compact if the underlying manifold is a compact Kähler threefold. In Section 4.4, we compute the integers $n_X(c)$ defined in Section 3 in some cases.

4.1 The equations on compact Kähler threefolds

Firstly, we have the following.

Proposition 4.1. *Let X be a compact Kähler threefold. Then the equations* (2.1) *and* (2.2) *reduce to the following.*

$$\bar\partial_A \alpha = \bar\partial_A \beta = \bar\partial_A^* \beta = \alpha u = 0, \tag{4.1}$$

$$F_{A'}^{0,2} = \bar\partial^* u = \bar\alpha \beta = 0, \quad i\Lambda F_{A'}^{1,1} = \frac{1}{8}\left(|u|^2 + |\beta|^2 - |\alpha|^2\right) \tag{4.2}$$

proof. Using the second equation in (2.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} ||\bar\partial_A \beta||_{L^2}^2 &= \langle \beta, \bar\partial_A^* \bar\partial_A \beta \rangle_{L^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\langle \beta, -\bar\partial_A^*(\alpha u)\rangle_{L^2} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\langle \beta \wedge \bar\partial_A \bar\alpha, u\rangle_{L^2} - \frac{1}{2}\langle \beta, (\bar\partial_A^* u)\alpha\rangle_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

The second term in the last line of the above (4.3) can be computed as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\beta,(\bar\partial^* u)\alpha\rangle_{L^2} &= \langle\beta,-F^{0,2}_{A'}\alpha\rangle_{L^2}+\frac{1}{4}|||\alpha||\beta|||^2_{L^2}\\ &= \langle\beta,-\bar\partial_A\bar\partial_A\alpha\rangle_{L^2}+\frac{1}{4}|||\alpha||\beta|||^2_{L^2}\\ &= \langle\beta,\bar\partial_A\bar\partial^*_A\beta\rangle_{L^2}+\frac{1}{4}|||\alpha||\beta|||^2_{L^2}\\ &= ||\bar\partial^*_A\beta||^2_{L^2}+\frac{1}{4}|||\alpha||\beta|||^2_{L^2}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

On the other hand, from the first equation in (2.2) and the identity $\bar\partial_A F^{0,2}_A = 0$ which holds for an integrable complex structure, we get

$$\bar\partial\bar\partial^* u = \frac{1}{4}(\bar\partial_A\bar\alpha)\beta+\frac{1}{4}\bar\alpha\bar\partial_A\beta.$$

From this we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}||\bar\partial^* u||^2_{L^2} &= \langle u,\bar\partial\bar\partial^* u\rangle_{L^2}\\ &= \frac{1}{4}\langle u,(\bar\partial_A\bar\alpha)\wedge\beta\rangle_{L^2}+\frac{1}{4}\langle u,\bar\alpha\bar\partial_A\beta\rangle_{L^2}\\ &= \frac{1}{4}\langle u,(\bar\partial_A\bar\alpha)\wedge\beta\rangle_{L^2}-\frac{1}{8}|||\alpha||u|||^2_{L^2}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

Hence, from (4.3), (4.4) and (4.5), we get

$$||\bar\partial_A\beta||^2_{L^2}+2||\bar\partial^* u||^2_{L^2}+\frac{1}{4}|||\alpha||u|||^2_{L^2}+\frac{1}{2}||\bar\partial^*_A\beta||^2_{L^2}+\frac{1}{8}|||\alpha||\beta|||^2_{L^2}=0.$$

Thus, the assertion holds. □

We define the degree of ξ by

$$\deg\xi := c_1(\xi)\cdot[\omega^2]=\frac{i}{2\pi}\int_X F_{A'}\wedge\omega^2.$$

Proposition 4.2. *Let X be a compact Kähler threefold, and let ξ be the characteristic line bundle of a Spin^c-structure on X. Let $(A,u,(\alpha,\beta))$ be a solution to the equations* (2.1) *and* (2.2)*. Then the following holds.*

(i) *If $\deg\xi<0$, then $\beta\equiv 0$ and $u\equiv 0$.*

(ii) *If $\deg\xi>0$, then $\alpha\equiv 0$.*

(iii) *If* $\deg \xi = 0$*, then* $\alpha \equiv 0$*,* $\beta \equiv 0, u \equiv 0$*.*

proof. From $\bar{\alpha}\beta = 0$, either α or β is zero on some open subset of X, thus either α or β is zero on the whole of X by unique continuation as $\bar{\partial}_A \alpha = 0$ and $\bar{\partial}_A \beta = \bar{\partial}_A^* \beta = 0$. Similarly, from $\alpha u = 0$, either α or u is zero on an open set in X, so either α or u is zero on X again by unique continuation as $\bar{\partial}_A \alpha = 0$ and $\bar{\partial}^* u = 0$. On the other hand, from the second equation in (4.2), we have

$$\deg \xi = \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_X F_{A'} \wedge \omega^2 = \frac{1}{16\pi} \int_X \left(|u|^2 + |\beta|^2 - |\alpha|^2 \right) vol. \tag{4.6}$$

Firstly, we consider the case $\deg \xi < 0$. In this case, because of (4.6), $\alpha \equiv 0$ contradicts $\deg \xi < 0$, thus we have $\alpha \not\equiv 0$. Then, from the above reasoning in the top of this proof, we get $\beta \equiv 0, u \equiv 0$.

Secondly, we consider the case $\deg \xi > 0$. In this case, if $\beta \equiv 0$ and $u \equiv 0$, we get a contradiction again from (4.6). Thus, $\beta \not\equiv 0$ or $u \not\equiv 0$, and therefore $\alpha \equiv 0$.

Finally, we consider the case $\deg \xi = 0$. If $\alpha \not\equiv 0$, then we get $\beta \equiv 0, u \equiv 0$; and this results in $\deg \xi < 0$. Hence $\alpha \equiv 0$. Then, as $\alpha \equiv 0$, again from (4.6), we get $\beta \equiv 0$ and $u \equiv 0$. □

From Proposition 4.2 (iii) above, we immediately get the following.

Proposition 4.3. *Let X be a compact Kähler threefold, and let ξ be the characteristic line bundle of a Spin^c-structure on X. Let $(A, u, (\alpha, \beta))$ be a solution to the equations* (2.1) *and* (2.2)*. Then, if* $\deg \xi = 0$*, the moduli space is isomorphic to* $H^1(X, \mathbb{R})/H^1(X, \mathbb{Z})$*.*

proof. From Proposition 4.2 (iii), we get $\alpha \equiv \beta \equiv u \equiv 0$. Then, from the Hitchin–Kobayashi correspondence of the Hermitian–Einstein connection for line bundles, the moduli space $\mathcal{M}$ is identified with the moduli space of holomorphic structures on ξ. Since ξ is topologically trivial, it is then isomorphic to $H^1(X, \mathbb{R})/H^1(X, \mathbb{Z})$. □

4.2 The moduli space for the negative degree case

Let X be a compact Kähler threefold. In this subsection, we describe the moduli space $\mathcal{M}$ of solutions to the equations (4.1) and (4.2) for the case $\deg \xi < 0$, where ξ is the characteristic line bundle of a *Spin^c*-structure on X. In this case, from Proposition 4.2, we have $\beta \equiv 0$ and $u \equiv 0$. Thus the equations reduce to the vortex equations (see [Br] and [G1]). We have the

following description of the moduli space, which was originally obtained by Thomas [Th] in the context of the Seiberg–Witten equations on compact Kähler threefolds.

Proposition 4.4 ([Th], Th. 2.6)**.** *Let X be a compact Kähler threefold, and let c be a Spin^c-structure on X with $\deg \xi < 0$, where ξ is the characteristic line bundle of the Spin^c-structure. Then the moduli space of solutions to the equations* (4.1) *and* (4.2) *can be identified with $\bigcup_\xi \mathbb{P}H^0\left(X, (K_X \otimes \xi)^{1/2}\right)$, where the union is taken through all holomorphic structures on ξ.*

proof. This is derived from a result by Bradlow [Br, Th. 4.3]. For the original Seiberg–Witten case, the corresponding result was described by Witten [W] (see also [FM, §2]).

Firstly, we fix a hermitian metric k on ξ and a section $\alpha \in \Gamma(X, L)$. We then vary the hermitian metric by e^u, where u is a real-valued function. The induced unitary connection on ξ can be written as $A_k + 2\partial u$, where A_k is a unitary connection on ξ induced from the metric k, and the second equation in (4.2) becomes

$$\Delta u + \frac{1}{8}|\alpha|_k^2 e^{2u} = -i\Lambda F_{A_k}, \tag{4.7}$$

where Δ is the negative definite Laplacian on functions. From the assumption that $\deg \xi < 0$, we have $\int_X -i\Lambda F_{A_0} dV > 0$ and also $\frac{1}{8}|\alpha|_k$ is strictly positive somewhere. Thus, as in [Br], we can invoke results by Kazdan–Warner [KW] to deduce that there exists a unique solution u to the equation (4.7). Hence, for each fixed non-trivial section of $(K_X \otimes \xi)^{1/2}$, we have a solution to the equations (4.1) and (4.2).

On the other hand, two sections differed by a non-zero constant are gauge equivalent solutions; and two gauge equivalent solutions α and α' represent the same point in $\mathbb{P}H^0\left(X, (K_X \otimes \xi)^{1/2}\right)$ since holomorphic automorphisms of a holomorphic line bundle consist of only non-zero constant functions. Hence the assertion holds. □

Remark 4.5. There is an algebraic counterpart of the Seiberg–Witten invariants, called *Poincaré invariants*, by Dürr, Kabanov and Okonek [DKO]. These are defined through the Hilbert schemes of divisors on a smooth projective variety. They constructed a perfect obstruction theory in the sense of Behrend and Fantechi [BF] on the Hilbert schemes under some assumptions, and defined the Poincaré invariants as virtual intersection numbers on the Hilbert schemes, which are consequently deformation invariants. The assumptions are satisfied for smooth projective surfaces, and the invariants

were proved to be equivalent to the Seiberg–Witten invariants (see [DKO], [CK] for more detail).

The invariants can be defined other than the surfaces. In fact, Dürr, Kabanov and Okonek constructed the perfect obstruction theory under the assumption that $H^i(\mathcal{O}_D(D)) = 0$ for all $i > 1$ and for any point D in the Hilbert scheme of divisors on a smooth projective variety with a fixed topological type [DKO, Th. 1.12]. (Note that the obstruction space is $H^1(\mathcal{O}_D(D))$.) The above assumption is satisfied in the case we are describing in this subsection (i.e. the case for $\deg \xi < 0$) for example with X being a compact Calabi–Yau or Fano threefold as below. (This was also mentioned in [DKO, Remark 1.13].)

We consider the following short exact sequence.

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(D) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_D(D) \longrightarrow 0.$$

From this, we get

$$\cdots \longrightarrow H^1(\mathcal{O}_X(D)) \longrightarrow H^2(\mathcal{O}_D(D)) \longrightarrow H^2(\mathcal{O}_X) \longrightarrow H^2(\mathcal{O}_X(D)) \longrightarrow \cdots . \tag{4.8}$$

Here, we think of $\mathcal{O}_X(D)$ as L. If $K_X \cong \mathcal{O}$ or $K_X < 0$ and $\deg \xi < 0$, then $\deg L < 0$ as $L^2 = K_X \otimes \xi$. Thus from the Kodaira vanishing theorem, we obtain $H^i(\mathcal{O}_X(D)) = 0$ for $i < 3$. Hence, from this and (4.8), we get

$$H^2(\mathcal{O}_D(D)) \cong H^2(\mathcal{O}_X).$$

From the Serre duality, we have $H^2(\mathcal{O}_X) \cong H^1(K_X)^\vee$. Hence, if X is a compact Calabi–Yau or Fano threefold, $H^2(\mathcal{O}_D(D)) = 0$. (This is deduced from $H^1(K_X) \cong H^1(\mathcal{O}_X) = 0$ for the Calabi–Yau case, and from the Kodaira vanishing theorem for the Fano case.) Therefore, one can construct the Poincaré invariants of Dürr, Kabanov and Okonek in these cases. □

4.3 Compactness of the moduli space

In this subsection, we prove that the moduli spaces of solutions to the Vafa–Witten equations are compact when the underlying manifold is a compact Kähler threefold. In order to do that, we first introduce the following rescaled equations.

Rescaled equations. Let X be a compact Kähler threefold. We introduce a scaling parameter $s > 0$ to the equation (4.1) and (4.2) as follows.

$$\bar\partial_A \alpha = \bar\partial_A \beta = \bar\partial_A^* \beta = \alpha u = 0, \tag{4.9}$$

$$F_{A'}^{0,2} = \bar\partial^* u = \bar\alpha \beta = 0, \quad i\Lambda F_{A'}^{1,1} = \frac{s}{8}\left(|u|^2 + |\beta|^2 - |\alpha|^2\right). \tag{4.10}$$

Similar rescaled equations for the Seiberg–Witten equations on compact symplectic four-manifolds were introduced by Taubes in [Ta1] (see also [Ta2]), and the ones for the vortex equations and its asymptotic of solutions as $s \to \infty$ were studied by Baptista [Ba1], [Ba2] and Liu [L].

We define the moduli space of solutions to the equations (4.9) and (4.10), which we denote by $\mathcal{M}(s)$, in the same way as we do that for the equations (2.1) and (2.2). Note that the presence of the parameter s does not affect the statements thus far. We prove the following below.

Proposition 4.6. *Let X be a compact Kähler threefold. Then the moduli space $\mathcal{M}(s)$ is compact if s is sufficiently large.*

Since $(A, u, (\alpha, \beta)) \mapsto (A, \sqrt{s}u, \sqrt{s}(\alpha, \beta))$ gives a bijection between $\mathcal{M}(s)$ and $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(1)$, we get the following.

Corollary 4.7. *Let X be a compact Kähler threefold. Then the moduli space $\mathcal{M}$ of solution to the equations* (4.1) *and* (4.2) *is compact.*

We prove Proposition 4.6 in three steps (I), (II) and (III) below. In the rest of this subsection, constants denoted by C or D do not depend on the parameter s.

(I) Bounds on $|\alpha|$, $|\beta|$ and $|u|$. We prove L^∞-bounds on α, β and u.

Firstly, we consider the case $\deg \xi < 0$ case. In this case, from Proposition 4.2, we have $\beta \equiv 0$ and $u \equiv 0$. We also have the following point-wise estimate on α.

Lemma 4.8. *Let X be a compact Kähler threefold, and let ξ be the characteristic line bundle of a Spin^c-structure on X. Let $(A, u, (\alpha, \beta))$ be a solution to the equations* (4.9) *and* (4.10)*. Then, if $\deg \xi < 0$ then $|\alpha| \leq C/\sqrt{s}$, where C is a positive constant which depends upon the curvature of the canonical connection on K_X^{-1}.*

proof. For $\alpha \in \Omega^{0,0}(X, L)$, we have the following from the Kähler identity (see e.g. [Ko, § 2.2] or [DK, § 6.1.3]).

$$\bar{\partial}_A^* \bar{\partial}_A \alpha = \frac{1}{2} \nabla_A^* \nabla_A \alpha - \frac{1}{2} i(\Lambda F_A)\alpha. \tag{4.11}$$

Then, using the equations (4.1) and (4.2), we obtain

$$0 = \frac{1}{2} \nabla_A^* \nabla_A \alpha - \frac{1}{2} \left(-\frac{1}{2} F_{K_X^{-1}} - \frac{s}{8} |\alpha|^2 \right) \alpha.$$

On the other hand, we have $\frac{1}{2}\Delta|\alpha|^2 = \langle \nabla_A^* \nabla_A \alpha, \alpha\rangle - |\nabla_A \alpha|^2$, where Δ is the Laplacian on functions. Thus, we get

$$\frac{1}{2}\Delta|\alpha|^2 + |\nabla_A\alpha|^2 = -\frac{1}{2}F_{K_X^{-1}}|\alpha|^2 - \frac{s}{8}|\alpha|^4.$$

From the maximum principle, if x_0 is a local maximum of $|\alpha|^2(x)$, we obtain

$$-\frac{1}{2}F_{K_X^{-1}}(x_0)|\alpha|^2(x_0) - \frac{s}{8}|\alpha|^4(x_0) \geq 0.$$

Thus, we get either $|\alpha|^2(x_0) = 0$ or $|\alpha|^2(x_0) \leq -4F_{K_X^{-1}}(x_0)/s$. Hence the assertion holds. □

If $\deg \xi > 0$, from Proposition 4.2, we have $\alpha \equiv 0$. In this case, similar to Lemma 4.8, we have the following point-wise estimate on β.

Lemma 4.9. *Let X be a compact Kähler threefold, and let ξ be the characteristic line bundle of a Spin^c-structure on X. Let $(A, u, (\alpha, \beta))$ be a solution to the equations* (4.9) *and* (4.10)*. Then, if $\deg \xi > 0$ then $|\beta| \leq C/\sqrt{s}$, where C is a positive constant which depends upon the curvature of the canonical connection on K_X^{-1} and of a connection on $\Lambda^{0,2}$. In addition, there exists a constant $D > 0$, which depends on the metric of the underlying manifold X and $\deg \xi$ such that $|u| \leq D/s$.*

proof. For $\beta \in \Omega^{0,2}(X, L)$, we have the following again from the Kähler identity.

$$\bar\partial_A^* \bar\partial_A \beta + \bar\partial_A \bar\partial_A^* \beta = \frac{1}{2}\tilde\nabla_A^* \tilde\nabla_A \beta + \frac{1}{2} i(\Lambda(F' + F_A))\beta, \tag{4.12}$$

where $\tilde\nabla_A$ is the unitary connection of $\Lambda^{0,2} \otimes L$, and $F' + F_A$ is the curvature of $\tilde\nabla_A$. Then, using the equations (4.9) and (4.10), we obtain

$$0 = \frac{1}{2}\tilde\nabla_A^* \tilde\nabla_A \beta + \frac{1}{2}\left(i(\Lambda F') - \frac{1}{2}F_{K_X^{-1}} + \frac{s}{8}(|u|^2 + |\beta|^2)\right)\beta,$$

Thus, again using the maximum principle, if x_1 is a local maximum of $|\beta|^2(x)$, then we get

$$-\frac{1}{2}\left(i(\Lambda F') - \frac{1}{2}F_{K_X^{-1}}\right)|\beta|^2(x_1) - \frac{s}{8}\left(|u|^2(x_1) + |\beta|^2(x_1)\right)|\beta|^2(x_1) \geq 0.$$

Thus, either $|\beta|^2(x_1) = 0$ or $|\beta|^2(x_1) + |u|^2(x_1) \leq \left(-4i\Lambda F' + 4F_{K_X^{-1}}\right)/s$. Hence we get $|\beta| \leq C/s$ for a constant $C > 0$.

We next prove the bound on u. From the Weitzenböck formula, u satisfies $\langle \nabla\nabla^* u, u\rangle \leq C|u|^2$, where $C > 0$ is a constant which depends on the metric of the underlying manifold X. Hence, from a maximum principle, we get $|u| \leq C \int_X |u|^2$. On the other hand, from (4.6), $s \int_X |u|^2$ is bounded by $\deg \xi$ in this case. Thus the assertion holds. □

(II) Estimate on the curvature. We next prove the following estimate on the curvature.

Proposition 4.10. *Let $(A, u, (\alpha, \beta))$ a solution to the equations* (4.9) *and* (4.10)*. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $|F_A| \leq C$ if s is large enough.*

This type of estimate was obtained by Taubes [Ta2, Prop. 2.4] in the case of the Seiberg–Witten equations on compact symplectic four-manifolds (see also Kanda [Ka, Prop. 6.1]). Our proof goes in a similar way to those in [Ta2] and [Ka] except that we have the extra terms coming from u in the equations.

From Proposition 4.2, either α vanishes or β and u do if $\deg \xi \neq 0$. But, in the following, in order to avoid the proof becoming longer, we deal with the two cases simultaneously, namely, α, β and u appear at the same time.

Proof of Proposition 4.10. We write $F^+_{A'} := F^{2,0}_{A'} + F^0_{A'} + F^{0,2}_{A'}$, where $F^0_{A'}$ is the ω-component of the curvature, and denote by $F^\perp_{A'}$ the orthogonal component of $F_{A'}$ to $F^+_{A'}$ so that $F_{A'} = F^+_{A'} + F^\perp_{A'}$. An L^∞-bound for $F^+_{A'}$ comes from the equation (4.10) and the L^∞-bounds on α, β and u in Lemmas 4.8 and 4.9. We thus prove an L^∞-bound for $F^\perp_{A'}$ below.

From the Bianchi identity, we have

$$dF^+_{A'} + dF^\perp_{A'} = 0.$$

Thus, by the Weitzenböck formula, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\nabla^*\nabla F^\perp_{A'} + RF^\perp_{A'} = -P^\perp d^* dF^+_{A'}, \tag{4.13}$$

where $R \in \mathrm{Hom}(\Lambda^\perp, \Lambda^\perp)$ depends on the metric of the underlying manifold. From (4.9) and (4.10), the right hand side of (4.13) becomes the following.

$$\begin{aligned} P^\perp d^* d\left\{-\frac{is}{8}\left(|\alpha|^2 - |\beta|^2\right)\right\} &= -\frac{is}{8} P^\perp \left(\partial^*\partial + \bar\partial^*\bar\partial\right)\left(|\alpha|^2 - |\beta|^2 - |u|^2\right)\omega \\ &= -\frac{s}{4} P^\perp \left(\bar\partial\partial|\alpha|^2 + \partial\bar\partial|\beta|^2 + \partial\bar\partial|u|^2|\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence (4.13) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\nabla^*\nabla F_{A'}^{\perp} + RF_{A'}^{\perp} \\
&\quad = -\frac{s}{4}\langle F_A^{\perp}\alpha, \alpha\rangle_L - \frac{s}{4}\langle\left(F_A^{\perp} + F_{\Lambda^{0,2}}\right)\beta, \beta\rangle_{\Lambda^{0,2}\otimes L} - \frac{s}{4}\langle F_{K_X^{-1}}u, u\rangle_{K_X^{-1}} \\
&\qquad + \frac{s}{4}P^{\perp}\left\{\langle d_A\alpha, d_A\alpha\rangle_L + \langle d_{\tilde{\nabla}_A}\beta, d_{\tilde{\nabla}_A}\beta\rangle_{\Lambda^{0,2}\otimes L} + \langle d_{\nabla}u, d_{\nabla}u\rangle_{K_X^{-1}}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the inner product of the above with $F_A^{\perp}$, and using $(\Delta|F|)|F| \leq \langle\nabla^*\nabla F, F\rangle$, we obtain the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta + \frac{s}{4}(|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2)\right)|F_{A'}^{\perp}| \\
&\quad \leq |R||F_{A'}^{\perp}| + \frac{s}{4}|\beta|^2|F_{\Lambda^{0,2}}| + \frac{s}{4}|u|^2|F_{K_X^{-1}}| \\
&\qquad + \frac{s}{4}\left|P^{\perp}\left\{\langle d_A\alpha, d_A\alpha\rangle_L + \langle d_{\tilde{\nabla}_A}\beta, d_{\tilde{\nabla}_A}\beta\rangle_{\Lambda^{0,2}} + \langle d_{\nabla}u, d_{\nabla}u\rangle\right\rangle_{K_X^{-1}}\right\}\right| \\
&\quad \leq |R||F_A^{\perp}| + Cs|\beta|^2 + Cs|u|^2 + \frac{s}{4\sqrt{2}}\left(|\nabla_A\alpha|^2 + |\tilde{\nabla}_A\beta|^2 + |\nabla u|^2\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Put $\phi_0 := -\frac{s}{4\sqrt{2}}\left(|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 + |u|^2\right)$. Then we get

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta + \frac{s}{4}(|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2)\right)\left(|F_{A'}^{\perp}| - \phi_0\right) \leq |R||F_{A'}^{\perp}|. \tag{4.14}$$

We next consider a solution ϕ to the following equation.

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta + \frac{s}{4}\left(|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2\right)\right)\phi = |R||F_{A'}^{\perp}|. \tag{4.15}$$

From a maximal principle with (4.14) and (4.15), we get

$$|F_{A'}^{\perp}| \leq \phi_0 + \phi. \tag{4.16}$$

We next bound $||\phi||_{L^2(X)}$ by $\sup_X \phi$. Multiplying ϕ to (4.15), and adding $-\frac{s}{4}\left(|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2\right)\phi^2$, we get

$$\frac{1}{4}\Delta\phi^2 + \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\phi|^2 + \frac{s}{4}|\phi|^2 = |R||F_{A'}^{\perp}|\phi - \frac{s}{4}\left(|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2\right)\phi^2.$$

Then, using Hölder inequality to each term of the right hand side of the above equation, we get

$$\frac{1}{4}\Delta\phi^2 + \frac{s}{12}|\phi|^2 \leq \frac{6}{s}|R||F_{A'}^{\perp}|^2 + \frac{3}{16}s\left(|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2\right)^2\left(\sup_X \phi\right)^2.$$

Hence we obtain

$$\int_X \phi \leq C \left\{ \frac{1}{s^2} \int_X |F_{A'}^{\perp}|^2 + \frac{1}{s} \left(\sup_X \phi \right)^2 \int_X s \left(|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 \right)^2 \right\}.$$

Here, we have

$$\int_X \left\{ |F_{A'}^{+}|^2 - |F_{A'}^{\perp}|^2 \right\} = \langle c_1^2(\xi), [X] \rangle.$$

Therefore we get

$$||\phi||_{L^2(X)} \leq \frac{C}{s} + \frac{C}{s^2} \sup_X \phi.$$

We next introduce a function $\psi \in L_2^2$ which satisfies

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta + \frac{s}{4} \left(|\alpha|^2 + \beta|^2 \right) \right) \psi = |R||F_{A'}^{\perp}| \left(|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 \right). \tag{4.17}$$

By using a maximum principle, we get

$$\sup_X \psi \leq \frac{4}{s} R_0 \sup_X |F_{A'}^{\perp}|, \tag{4.18}$$

where $R_0 := \sup_X |R|$. From (4.15) and (4.17), we have

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta + \frac{s}{4} \left(|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 \right) \right) (\phi - \psi) = |R||F_{A'}^{\perp}| \left(|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 \right).$$

As in [Ka], we use the following form of the maximum principle by Gilberg–Trudinger (see [Ka, Th. 6.6]).

Theorem 4.11 ([GT])**.** *Let $D := -a^{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} + b^j \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$ be an elliptic operator defined on the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^6$ and satisfy the following condition.*

(1) *Let A be a symmetric matrix $(a^{ij})_{ij}$. There exist positive constants $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2$ such that $\lambda_1 |\xi|^2 \geq \xi^t A \xi \geq \lambda_2 |\xi|^2$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^6$. In other word, A is uniformly positive definite.*

(2) *There exists $\lambda_3 \geq 0$ such that $|b| \leq \lambda_3$ and $c \geq -\lambda_3$.*

Then there exists a positive constant C' which depends only on λ_1, λ_2 and λ_3 with the following significance. If $f \in C^2(\overline{B}_1)$ obeys the differential inequality $Df \leq g$ on $B_1^+ \subset B_1$, then it follows that

$$\sup_{B_{1/2}} f \leq C' \left(||f||_{L^2(B_1^+)} + ||g||_{L^6(B_1^+)} \right),$$

where B_1^+ denotes the subset $\{x \in B_1 : f(x) \geq 0\}$.

From this, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_X(\phi-\psi) &= \sup_{B_{1/2}(x)}(\phi-\psi)\\ &\le C\left(||\phi||_{L^2(X)}+||\psi||_{L^2(X)}+\sup_X|F_{A'}^{\perp}||\,|\alpha|^2+|\beta|^2||_{L^2(X)}\right)\\ &\le C\left(\frac{C}{s}+\frac{C}{s^2}\sup_X\phi+\frac{1}{s}\sup_X|F_{A'}^{\perp}|\right).\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, from (4.18), we have

$$\sup_X\phi-\frac{C}{s}\sup_X|F_{A'}^{\perp}|\le\sup_X(\phi-\psi).$$

Hence we get

$$\sup_X\phi\le C\left(\frac{1}{s}+\frac{1}{s}\sup_X|F_{A'}^{\perp}|\right)$$

if s is large enough. Therefore, from (4.16), we get

$$\sup_X|F_{A'}^{\perp}|\le C$$

if s is large enough. Thus the assertion holds. □

(III) Proof of Proposition 4.6. Once the L^∞-bound on the curvatures is obtained, the rest of the argument will be rather standard. The following argument is modeled on ones by [CGMS, Th. 3.2] and [WJ, pp. 61–67].

From Proposition 4.10, the curvatures F_{A_i} are uniformly bounded in L^p for $p>1$. Thus, from [U, Th. 1.5] (see also [WK, Th. A]), there exist gauge transformations $g_i\in\mathcal{G}_{L_2^p}$ and a constant $C>0$ such that

$$||g_i(A_i-A_0)||_{L_1^p}\le C.$$

We also have an L_2^p-bound on $g_i(\alpha_i,\beta_i)$ as (α_i,β_i) has L^∞-bound. Hence we get a weak limit $(A,u,(\alpha,\beta))$ in L_1^p after taking a subsequence if necessary. From Proposition 3.1, there exists a gauge transformation $g\in\mathcal{G}_{L_2^p}$ such that $g(A,u,(\alpha,\beta))$ is smooth. Hence we suppose that the limit $(A,u,(\alpha,\beta))$ is smooth.

We then invoke the local slice theorem [U, Th. 1.3] (see also [WK, Th. 8.1]), namely, we find $h_i\in\mathcal{G}_{L_2^p}$ with $d_A^*(h_i(A_i)-A)=0$ for each i and a constant $C>0$ such that the following hold for each i.

$$||h_i(A_i)-A||_{L^\infty}\le C||A_i-A||_{L^\infty},\quad ||h_i(A_i)-A||_{L_1^p}\le C||A_i-A||_{L_1^p}.$$

In addition, $\{h_i\}$ is uniformly bounded in L^p_2. Then we replace $(A_i, u_i, (\alpha_i, \beta_i))$ by $h_i(A_i, u_i, (\alpha_i, \beta_i))$. For this sequence, we have the gauge condition $d^*_A(A_i - A) = 0$ with a uniform L^p_1-bound with L^p_2-gauges. Thus, the elliptic estimate yields the following.

$$||A_i - A||_{L^p_\ell} \leq C_\ell, \quad ||(u_i, (\alpha_i, \beta_i))||_{L^p_\ell} \leq C_\ell$$

for each $\ell \geq 1$ and all i, where C_ℓ's are positive constants. Hence the assertion holds. □

4.4 Some computations

In the previous subsection, we proved that the moduli spaces are compact in the Kähler case. Hence the assumption (A1) in Section 3 is satisfied in this case. Regarding the assumption (A2) in Section 3 on reducibles, we have the following. This holds for compact symplectic 6-manifolds.

Proposition 4.12. *Let X be a compact symplectic 6-manifold, and threefold, and let ξ be the characteristic line bundle of a Spin^c-structure on X. If $\deg \xi < 0$, then there are no reducible solutions to the equations.*

proof. If $\alpha = \beta = 0$, then it contradicts $\deg \xi < 0$ as $\deg \xi = \frac{1}{16\pi} \int_X (|u|^2 + |\beta|^2 - |\alpha|^2) vol$. Thus, the assertion holds. □

The following holds if the underlying manifolds are Kähler threefolds.

Proposition 4.13. *Let X be a compact Kähler threefold, and threefold, and let ξ be the characteristic line bundle of a Spin^c-structure on X. If $\deg \xi > 0$ and $K_X < 0$, then there are no reducible solutions to the equations.*

proof. If $\deg \xi > 0$, then $\alpha \equiv 0$ from Proposition 4.2. Since we assume that $K_X < 0$, we have $u \equiv 0$. Suppose now for a contradiction that $\beta \equiv 0$. Then we get $\deg \xi = 0$ again from (4.6). This is a contradiction. Hence $\beta \not\equiv 0$. □

Therefore, in these cases, one can define the integers $n_X(c)$ in Section 3 from the moduli space $\mathcal{M}$. We compute some of them below. These are analogies of those for the Seiberg–Witten invariants, presented as Proposition 7.3.1 in [M].

Firstly, we have the following.

Proposition 4.14. *Let X be a compact Kähler threefold with $K_X < 0$, and let c be a Spin^c-structure on X with $\deg \xi < 0$, where ξ is the characteristic line bundle of the Spin^c-structure. Then there are no solutions to the equation (4.1) and (4.2). Namely, the moduli space is empty in this case.*

proof. Suppose for a contradiction that there is a solution $(A, u, (\alpha, \beta))$ to the equation (4.1) and (4.2). Since $\deg \xi < 0$, we get $\beta \equiv 0$ and $u \equiv 0$ from Proposition 4.2. As α is a holomorphic section of L, we get $\deg L > 0$. However, this contradicts the fact that $L^2 = K_X \otimes \xi$ has negative degree. Thus, the assertion holds. □

Hence, we get the following.

Corollary 4.15. *Let X be a compact Kähler threefold with $K_X < 0$, and let c be a Spin^c-structure on X with $\deg \xi < 0$, where ξ is the characteristic line bundle of the Spin^c-structure. Then $n_X(c) = 0$.*

For the case $K_X > 0$, we have the following.

Theorem 4.16. *Let X be a compact Kähler threefold with $c_2(X) = 0$. Let s_c be the Spin^c-structure coming from the complex structure. Assume that $K_X > 0$. Then $n_X(s_c) = 1$.*

proof. Since s_c is the Spin^c-structure coming from the complex structure, the corresponding line bundle ξ is K_X^{-1}. As we assume that $K_X > 0$, thus $\deg \xi < 0$; and $\beta \equiv 0$ and $u \equiv 0$. Because L is trivial in this case, we only have a solution (A_0, α_0), where A_0 is the canonical connection of ξ, and α_0 is a non-zero, constant section of L. Thus the moduli space $\mathcal{M}$ contains only a single point.

We then prove that the moduli space $\mathcal{M}$ is smooth, and its dimension is zero. Firstly, the index (2.5) vanishes, since we assume that $c_2(X) = 0$, and $c_1(L) = 0$ as L is trivial. Thus, the dimension of the moduli space is zero, if it is smooth.

We next prove that the moduli space is actually smooth. The proof goes in a similar way of that presented in [M, pp. 119–122] for the Seiberg–Witten case except that we have the extra terms coming from u in the equations.

Firstly, recall that the following elliptic complex of the Atiyah–Hitchin–Singer type associated to a solution to the equations (2.1) and (2.2).

$$\begin{aligned} i\Omega^0(\mathbb{R}) &\xrightarrow{L_1} i\Omega^1 \oplus \Omega^{0,3}(X) \oplus \left(\Omega^{0,0}(L) \oplus \Omega^{0,2}(L)\right) \\ &\xrightarrow{L_2} \left(i\Omega^2 \cap \left(\Omega^{0,2} \oplus \Omega^{2,0}\right) \oplus i\Omega^0\omega\right) \oplus \left(\Omega^{0,1}(L) \oplus \Omega^{0,3}(L)\right). \end{aligned}$$

We denote by H^0, H^1, H^2 the cohomology of the above complex. We now consider the above L_1 and L_2 at $(A, 0, (\alpha, 0))$. Then they become as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} L_1(ig) &= (2idg, 0, -i\alpha g, 0) \\ L_2(h, \upsilon, (a, b)) &= (P^+ d(ih) - \frac{1}{8} i\mathrm{Re}(a\bar{\alpha})\omega + \bar{\partial}^* \upsilon + \frac{1}{4}(\alpha\bar{b} - \bar{\alpha}b), \\ &\qquad \bar{\partial}a + \bar{\partial}^* b + \pi^{0,1}(ih)\alpha/2, \bar{\partial}b + \alpha\upsilon/2). \end{aligned}$$

Firstly, since α is a non-zero constant section, the kernel of L_1 is trivial. Thus, $H^0 = 0$.

We next assume that $L_2(h, \upsilon, (a, b)) = 0$. Then, from the second component of $\bar{\partial} L_2(h, \upsilon, (a, b)) = 0$, we get $\bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^* b + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\partial}(\pi^{0,1}(ih)\alpha) = 0$, where we used $\bar{\partial}\bar{\partial} = 0$ and $\bar{\partial}\alpha = 0$.

On the other hand, we have $\bar{\partial}(\pi^{0,1}(ih)) = (d(ih))^{0,2} = -\bar{\partial}^*\upsilon + \frac{\bar{\alpha}b}{2}$. In addition, from the third component of $\bar{\partial}^* L_2(h, \upsilon, (a, b))$, we obtain $\bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial} b + \frac{1}{2}\alpha\bar{\partial}^*\upsilon = 0$. Thus, we get

$$\bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^* b + \bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial} b + \frac{1}{4}|\alpha|^2 b = 0.$$

By taking L^2-inner product of this with b, we get $||\bar{\partial}^* b||^2_{L^2} + ||\bar{\partial} b||^2_{L^2} + \frac{1}{4}||\bar{\alpha} b||^2_{L^2} = 0$. Thus, $\bar{\partial}^* b = \bar{\partial} b = 0, \bar{\alpha} b = 0$. As $\alpha \neq 0$, we get $b \equiv 0$ by the unique continuation.

We next write $ih = \bar{\chi} - \chi$ by some $\bar{\chi} \in \Omega^{0,1}(X, \mathbb{C})$. Then $L_2(ih, \upsilon, (a, b)) = 0$ becomes

$$P^+(\partial\bar{\chi} - \bar{\partial}\chi) - \frac{i}{2}\mathrm{Re}(a\bar{\alpha})\omega + \bar{\partial}^*\upsilon = 0, \tag{4.19}$$

$$\bar{\partial} a + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\chi}\alpha = 0, \quad \alpha\upsilon = 0. \tag{4.20}$$

We now write $a = (p + iq)\alpha$, where p and q are real-valued functions. Then by adding $L_a(iq)$ to $(ih, \upsilon, (a, b))$, we can make $a = p\alpha$. By this, the first equation of (4.19) is now

$$\bar{\partial}(p\alpha) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\chi}\alpha = 0.$$

From this, $\bar{\chi} = -2\bar{\partial}(p\alpha)$. Putting this into (4.20), we get $4\Delta p + p = 0$. Thus, we get $p = 0$. Hence $ih = 0$ and $\upsilon = 0$. Thus, the kernel of L_2 is in the image of L_1. Therefore $H^1 = 0$.

As we mentioned in the second paragraph of this proof, the index of the elliptic complex is zero; and since $H^0 = H^1 = 0$ as computed above, we conclude that $H^2 = 0$. Thus, $n_X(s_c) = \pm 1$.

We then determine the sign of the number $n_X(s_c)$. As in [M, p.121], we decompose the operator L_1 and L_2 as $L_1 = \overline{L}_1 + M_1$, $L_2 = \overline{L}_2 + M_2$, where $\overline{L}_1 = (2d, 0)$, $\overline{L}_2 = (P^+ d + \bar{\partial}^*, \bar{\partial} + \bar{\partial}^*)$, and M_1 and M_2 are operators of order zero. We denote by $\mathcal{H}^i$ the space of harmonic forms defined by $\overline{L}_i$. Then the orientation of the determinant bundle of the elliptic complex is given by that of $\mathcal{H}^i$'s, which are induced by the given orientations on $H^i(X, i\mathbb{R})$ and

$H^{0,i}(X)$. Hence the sign of the determinant bundle at the solution is that of the following complex.

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0(X, i\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \begin{array}{c} H^1(X, i\mathbb{R}) \oplus H^{0,3}(X, \mathbb{C}) \\ \oplus \\ H^{0,0}(X, \mathbb{C}) \oplus H^{0,2}(X, \mathbb{C}) \end{array} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{c} H^{0,2}(X, \mathbb{C}) \oplus H^0(X, i\mathbb{R})\omega \\ \oplus \\ H^{0,1}(X, \mathbb{C}) \oplus H^{0,3}(X, \mathbb{C}) \end{array} \longrightarrow 0.$$

In the above, the maps $H^1(X, i\mathbb{R}) \to H^{0,1}(X, \mathbb{C})$, $H^{0,3}(X) \to H^{0,3}(X, \mathbb{C})$ and $H^{0,2}(X, \mathbb{C}) \to H^{0,2}(X, \mathbb{C})$ are orientation preserving isomorphisms induced by M_2. Thus, by factoring through these isomorphisms, we get

$$0 \longrightarrow i\mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow i\mathbb{R} \longrightarrow 0,$$

where the first map is minus the inclusion and the second map is $i/8$ times the real part. Hence, with the given orientation, the sign of the determinant of this complex is $+1$. □

References

[Ba1] J. M. Baptista, *On the L^2 metrics of vortex moduli spaces*, Nucl. Phys. B **844**, (2010), 308–333.

[Ba2] J. M. Baptista, *Moduli spaces of Abelian vortices on Kähler manifolds*, arXiv:1211.0012

[BF] K. Behrend and B. Fantechi, *The intrinsic normal cone*, Invent. math. **128** (1997), 45–88.

[Br] S. B. Bradlow, *Vortices in holomorphic line bundles over closed Kähler manifolds*, Comm. Math. Phys. **135** (1990), 1–17.

[BG] S. B. Bradlow and O. García-Prada, *Non-abelian monopoles and vortices*, Geometry and physics (Aarhus, 1995), 567–589, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math. **184** Dekker, New York, 1997.

[CK] H. Chang, Y. Kiem, *Poincaré invariants are Seiberg–Witten invariants*, Geom. Topol. **17** (2013), 1149–1163.

[CGMS] K. Cieliebak, A. R. Gaio, I. Mundet i Riera and D. A. Salamon, *The symplectic vortex equations and invariants of Hamiltonian group actions*, J. Symplectic Geom. **1** (2002), 543–645.

[DK] S. K. Donaldson and P. B. Kronheimer, *The Geometry of Four-Manifolds*, Oxford University Press, 1990.

[DKO] M. Dürr, A. Kabanov and C. Okonek, *Poincaré invariants*, Topology **46** (2007), 225–294.

[FM] R. Friedman and J. W. Morgan, *Algebraic surfaces and Seiberg-Witten invariants*, J. Algebraic Geom. **6** (1997), 445–479.

[G1] O. García-Prada, *Invariant connections and vortices*, Comm. Math. Phys. **156** (1993), 527–546.

[G2] O. García-Prada, *Seiberg-Witten invariants and vortex equations*, Symétries quantiques (Les Houches, 1995), 885–934, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1998.

[GT] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, 2nd edition, Springer-Verlag, 1983.

[HT] M. Hutchings and C. H. Taubes, *An introduction to the Seiberg-Witten equations on symplectic four-manifolds*, Symplectic geometry and topology (Park City, UT, 1997), 103–142, Amer. Math. Soc., 1999.

[Ka] Y. Kanda, *The monopole equations and J-holomorphic curves on weakly convex almost Kähler 4-manifolds*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **353** (2001), 2215–2243.

[Ko] D. Kotschick, *The Seiberg–Witten invariants of symplectic four-manifolds (after C. H. Taubes)*, Séminaire Bourbaki, Vol 1995/96. Astérisque **241** (1997), 195–220.

[KW] J. L. Kazdan and F. W. Warner, *Curvature functions for compact 2-manifolds*, Ann. of Math. **99** (1974), 14–47.

[L] C. Liu, *Dynamics of Abelian vortices without common zeros in the adiabatic limit*, Comm. Math. Phys. **329** (2014), 169–206.

[LM] H. B. Lawson, Jr. and M-L. Michelsohn, *Spin geometry*, Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ, 1989.

[M] J. W. Morgan, *The Seiberg–Witten equations and applications to the topology of smooth of smooth four-manifolds*, Mathematical Notes, **44** Princeton University Press NJ, 1996.

[R] Y. Ruan, *Virtual neighborhoods and monopole equations* in "Topics in Symplectic 4-manifolds", Int. Press, Cambridge, MA, 1998.

[Ta1] C. H. Taubes, *The Seiberg-Witten invariants and symplectic forms*, Math. Res. Lett. **1** (1994), 809–822.

[Ta2] C. H. Taubes, *SW ⇒ Gr: From the Seiberg-Witten equations to pseudo-holomorphic curves*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **9** (1996), 845–918.

[Th] R. P. W. Thomas, *The Seiberg–Witten equations on complex 3-folds*, First Year dissertation, University of Oxford, 1995.

[U] K. K. Uhlenbeck, *Connections with L^p bounds on curvature*, Comm. Math. Phys. **83** (1982), 31–42.

[WJ] J. Wehrheim, *Vortex invariants and toric manifolds*, Dissertation, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, 2008, arXiv: 08120299.

[WK] K. Wehrheim, *Uhlenbeck compactness*, EMS Series of Lectures in Mathematics. European Mathematical Society, Zurich, 2004.

[W] E. Witten, *Monopoles and 4-manifolds*, Math. Res. Letters **1** (1994), 764–796.

National Center for Theoretical Sciences (South), National Cheng Kung University, Tainan 701, Taiwan
yu2tanaka@gmail.com